

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 55 PM '00

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
99-25

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Patrick Groot

42

2155 E. Maple

Flagstaff, AZ 86002

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

071

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MM 99-25

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Roxane GeorgeRoxane George2155 E. Maple #117Flagstaff, AZ 86004520-774-6542No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

071

EX PARTE ORAL HEARING  
MM 9725  
RECEIVED  
ORIGINAL

MAR - 6 2000

January 14, 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

David Sherman  
David Sherman  
Box 874  
Flagstaff AZ  
86002

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

JF 1

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MM 99-25

ORIGINAL

January 14, 2000

RECEIVED  
MAR - 6 2000FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

  
James J. Mociulnik  
PO Box 1561  
Flagstaff AZ 86002

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

071

EX PARTE ORAL HEARING  
MAR 19 25 ORIGINAL

January 14, 2000

RECEIVED  
MAR - 6 2000FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Brian Nowicki

BRIAN NOWICKI  
403 S LEROUX  
FLAGSTAFF AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd 021  
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

  
Richard A. Rogers  
907 Summit Ave  
Flagstaff AZ  
86001

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

071

MM 99-25

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000  
MAR - 6 2000  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Clayton Beverly

Pobox 1154

FLAGSTAFF, AZ 86002

520-213-8435

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

OK

✕

2

**RECEIVED**

MM 99-25

January 14, 2000

**RECEIVED**

Jan 18 3 55 PM '00

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

  
 Joseph Langham  
 107 N. San Francisco #1  
 Flagstaff, AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd 01  
 List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 55 PM '00

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Phyllis Hogan

Phyllis Hogan  
107 N San Francisco St I  
Flagstaff AZ 86001  
520-774-2884

No. of Copies rec'd 051  
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

MM 99-25

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 55 PM '00

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

January 18, 2000

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Kevin Kalina

1902 W. San Francisco  
Flagstaff Az 86001

Ken K -

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

011

ORIGINAL

001 *mm**MM 99-25* EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

January 17, 2000

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Taubin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in its full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

DANIEL HORINE  
3925 MADERA RANCH RD  
FLAGSTAFF AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
 List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

01/

ORIGINAL  
MM 99-25

2

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
January 12, 2000  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,



GRENETA FINK  
1616 FT. VALLEY RD #38  
FLAGSTAFF AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

081

ORIGINAL

MM 99-25

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,



Kelley Wilson  
PO Box 15  
Flag, AZ 86002

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE



ORIGINAL

MM 99-25

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

January 2000

RECEIVED  
MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,



David C. Verner  
P.O. Box 30968  
Flagstaff Arizona  
86003

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

OK

ORIGINAL

MM 99-25

January 14, 2000

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED  
MAR - 6 2000FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Wendy Hannah  
P.O. 552  
Trinidad, CA 95570  
\_\_\_\_\_

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE

OH

ORIGINAL

MM 99-25

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

January **RECEIVED**

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,



BILL GOBUS  
111 E ASPEN #4  
FLG, AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd 011  
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED  
MAR 14 2000

MAR - 6 2000  
January 14, 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nationwide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of its Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in its full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

*[Signature]*  
LPN

Dan Goetsch  
2759 N Fairview  
Flagstaff, AZ 86004  
520 522 0592

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

021

ORIGINAL

MM 99-25

January 14, 2000

RECEIVED

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Colleen Kane

2401 w Rt 66 #105  
Flagstaff, AZ  
86001  
520-779-2372

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

071

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MM 99-25

RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

ORIGINAL

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

*Cynthia Nicas*

Cynthia Nicas  
1929 N. Thurgood Dr.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001  
520-774-3865

No. of Copies rec'd 01  
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MM 99-25

RECEIVED  
Jan 15

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

*Candice Parsons*

Candice Parsons

4875 E1 Oro Dr.

Flagstaff, AZ 86004

(520) 526-2661 wnl

No. of Copies rec'd 041  
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MM 99-25

RECEIVED  
January 21, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

*Melinda Katherine Taensmeier (Hobby)*

Melinda Katherine Taensmeier

25 Canyon Trail

Sedona, AZ 86351

520-284-1244

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

OK

ORIGINAL

Page 4  
EX PARTE OR LATE FILEDMM 99-25  
RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,



ANTHER REYNOLDS  
1706 N LAKEVIEW LN  
FLAGSTAFF AZ 86004

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

041

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

M M 99-25  
RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Priscilla Sklar
Priscilla Sklar  
940 W. Thorne Rd.  
Flagstaff, Az. 86001  
(520) 226-9327

 No. of Copies rec'd  
 List ABCDE

OT 1

ORIGINAL

MM 99-25  
RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000  
MAR - 6 2000FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

  
MATTHEWS "TONY" MARTINEZ  
GOGO N. DODGE  
FLAGSTAFF, AZ  
86004

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

041

MM 99-25

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Carolyn J. YoungCarolyn J. YoungP.O. B. #301Flagstaff, AZ 86002No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABOVE

071